UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,414	02/23/2004	Zhen Fu	RSW920030272US1	1858

23307 7590 04/26/2005

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER, LLP
2600 ARAMARK TOWER
1101 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 191072950

EXAMINER	
SHECHTMAN, SEAN P	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2125	

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/784,414	FU, ZHEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sean P. Shechtman	2125	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 February 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11-17,19-27,29 and 30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11-17,19-27,29 and 30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 February 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9, 11-17, 19-27, 29 and 30 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 19, 26, 27, 29, and 30 have been amended. Claims 10, 18, and 28 have been cancelled.

Drawings

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 1, filed February 2nd 2005, with respect to the objections to the drawings have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of the drawings has been withdrawn.

Specification

3. Objections withdrawn due to the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Rejections withdrawn due to the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. Rejections withdrawn due to the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-4, 11, 12, 14-16, 19-22, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,479,339 to Miller (See IDS filed 2/23/04) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,191 to Bassett ***or*** U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126295 to Doherty (See IDS filed 2/23/04).

Referring to claims 1 and 19, Miller teaches a moisture control system for a landscaping area having a landscaping element (Col. 1, lines 7-12), comprising:

a moisture delivery system controllable to provide moisture to the landscaping area (Col. 1, lines 7-12; Col. 4, lines 3-64); and

a moisture control processor (Col. 5, lines 41- Col. 6, line 6), coupled to said moisture delivery system, configured with:

real-time weather data for the landscaping area (Col. 3, lines 8-34; Col. 5, line 67 – Col. 6, line 6);

real-time moisture data for the landscaping area (Col. 3, lines 8-34; Col. 5, lines 13-33); and

landscaping-care data for the landscaping area (Col. 2, lines 14-16);

said moisture control processor comprises a personal computer configured to wirelessly access said weather, moisture and/or landscaping-care data (Col. 4, lines 60-67; Fig. 3, element 28 and 26);

whereby said moisture delivery system is controlled by said moisture control processor to deliver moisture and/or cease delivery of moisture to the landscaping area based on said weather, moisture, and/or landscaping-care data (Col. 3, lines 8-34; Col. 5, lines 13-33; Col. 10, lines 55-60).

Referring to claims 2 and 20, Miller teaches the method of claim 19, wherein said landscaping-care data includes data specific to each landscaping element in said landscaping area (Col. 5, lines 14-33).

Referring to claims 3 and 21, Miller teaches the method of claim 20, wherein said data specific to each landscaping element further includes the type of landscaping element (Col. 5, line 30).

Referring to claims 4 and 22, Miller teaches the method of claim 21, wherein said data specific to each landscaping element further includes the name of each landscaping element (Col. 5, line 30).

Referring to claims 11 and 29, Miller teaches the method of claim 19, wherein said weather data is obtained from sensors located within the landscaping area (Col. 6, lines 17-24).

Referring to claims 12 and 30, Miller teaches the method of claim 19, wherein said weather data is obtained from one or more weather databases accessible to said moisture control processor (Col. 12, lines 6-20; Col. 3, lines 9-16).

Referring to claim 14, Miller teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said moisture data is obtained from one or more moisture sensors situated in the landscaping area (Col. 5, lines 13-18).

Referring to claim 15, Miller teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said landscaping-care data is obtained from one or more landscaping databases accessible to said moisture control processor (Col. 13, lines 15-22; Col. 3, lines 9-16).

Referring to claim 16, Miller teaches the system of claim 15, wherein at least one of said one or more landscaping databases is a local database maintained by a user of the moisture delivery system (Col. 10, lines 55-67; Col. 3, lines 9-16).

Referring to claims 1 and 19, Miller teach all the limitations disclosed above and Miller further teaches a labtop computer (Col. 5, lines 41-60 of '339), however, Miller fail to teach that said landscaping area has a residence located thereon and wherein said moisture control processor is located within said residence.

However, referring to claims 1 and 19, Bassett teaches analogous art, wherein landscaping area has a residence located thereon and wherein a moisture control processor is located within said residence (Abstract; Col. 1, lines 10-41 of '191).

However, referring to claims 1 and 19, Doherty teaches analogous art, wherein landscaping area has a residence located thereon and wherein a moisture control processor is located within said residence (Abstract; Claims 1-28 of '295).

The examiner respectfully asserts that the shifting of location of parts is well within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 1023, 86 USPQ 70, 73, (CCPA 1950).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to combine the automated residence management system of Bassett ***or*** the residential gateway system for automated control of residential devices of Doherty with the irrigation control and management system of Miller.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Bassett with the teachings of Miller, because Bassett teaches an automated residence management and communication system (Col. 2, lines 47-48 of '191). Furthermore, Bassett teaches an automation system that can connect a microprocessor control device to various appliances, including a lawn sprinkler system (Col. 1, line 38; Col. 2, lines 9-13 '191). Further still, the invention of Bassett allows for performing diagnostic and analysis functions of said sprinkler system (Col. 2, line 13-20 of '191).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Doherty with the teachings of Miller, because Doherty teaches a system for effective implementation of a

residential gateway system for automated control of residential devices, such as a sprinkler (Page 3, paragraph 0026; Page 3, claim 2 of '295).

7. Claims 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,479,339 to Miller (See IDS filed 2/23/04) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,191 to Bassett ***or*** U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126295 to Doherty (See IDS filed 2/23/04) as applied to claims 12 and 15, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,712 to Bertini.

Referring to claims 13 and 17, Miller teaches a computer with a modem (Col. 5, lines 41-60 of '339).

Referring to claims 13 and 17, Miller teaches all the limitations disclosed above, however, Miller fails to teach the system above, wherein at least one of said one or more landscaping database is a global database accessible to said moisture controller via a network connection.

However, referring to claims 13 and 17, Bertini teaches analogous art, wherein landscaping database is a global database accessible to a moisture controller via a network connection (Col. 5, lines 7-29 of '712).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to further modify the teachings of Miller with the teachings of Bertini.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to further modify the teachings of Miller with the teachings of Bertini, because Bertini teaches a distributed feed system that includes a communication network including a central database for transmitting data relating to the central feed via the network (Col. 3, lines 5-10 of '712).

8. Claims 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,479,339 to Miller (See IDS filed 2/23/04) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,191 to Bassett *or* U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126295 to Doherty (See IDS filed 2/23/04) as applied to claims 12 and 15, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0182022 to Addink.

Referring to claims 13 and 17, Miller teaches a computer with a modem (Col. 5, lines 41-60 of '339).

Referring to claims 13 and 17, Miller teaches all the limitations disclosed above, however, Miller fails to teach the system above, wherein said one or more weather databases include one or mores weather databases accessible via the Internet.

However, referring to claims 13 and 17, Addink teaches analogous art, wherein weather database is accessible via the Internet (Page 5, paragraph 42 of '022).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to further modify the teachings of Miller with the teachings of Addink.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Addink with the teachings of Miller, because Addink teaches an interactive irrigation system (title of '022) that assists an irrigation user in attaining more efficient irrigation of an irrigated area. Furthermore, Addink teaches a system that allows for remote communication with an irrigation controller over the Internet (Page 1, paragraph 11 of '022).

9. Claims 5-7 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,479,339 to Miller (See IDS filed 2/23/04) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,191 to

Bassett *or* U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126295 to Doherty (See IDS filed 2/23/04) as applied to claims 4 and 22 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,400,815 to Whitehill.

Referring to claims 6 and 24, Miller teaches the system above, wherein said data specific to each landscaping element further includes a recommended moisture level for at least one of said landscaping elements (Col. 2, lines 10-16 of '339).

Referring to claims 7 and 25, Miller teaches the system above, wherein said data specific to each landscaping element further includes the soil type(s) in which the landscaping elements are planted (Col. 5, line 23 of '339).

Referring to claims 5 and 23, Miller teaches all the limitations disclosed above, however, Miller fails to teach the system above, wherein said data specific to each landscaping element further includes the age of at least one of said landscaping elements.

However, referring to claims 5 and 23, Whitehill teaches analogous art, wherein data specific to each landscaping element further includes the age of at least one of said landscaping elements (Col. 2, lines 23-49 of '815).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to further modify the teachings of Miller with the teachings of Whitehill.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Whitehill with the teachings of Miller, because Whitehill teaches an irrigation system controller (Col. 1, lines 6-20 of '815) that accounts for cumulative ET and performs automatic adjustments in response thereto, wherein the ET values are a function of crop age (Col. 2, line 23 – Col. 3, line 68 of '815)

10. Claims 8 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,479,339 to Miller (See IDS filed 2/23/04) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,191 to Bassett ***or*** U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126295 to Doherty (See IDS filed 2/23/04) as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,763,845 to Hoggard.

Miller teaches all the limitations disclosed above, however, Miller fails to teach the system above, wherein, referring to claims 8 and 26, said controlling of moisture flow includes the draining of all moisture delivery systems and ceasing of moisture delivery when said weather data indicates a temperature at the landscaping area has reached a predetermined threshold temperature.

However, Hoggard teaches analogous art, wherein referring to claims 8 and 26, Hoggard teaches controlling of moisture flow includes the draining of all moisture delivery systems and ceasing of moisture delivery when said weather data indicates a temperature at the landscaping area has reached a predetermined threshold temperature (Col. 5, line 53 – Col. 6, line 14; Abstract; Col. 1, lines 5-19 of '845).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to further modify the teachings of Miller with the teachings of Hoggard.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Hoggard with the teachings of Miller, because Hoggard teaches and automatic water drainage/refill system for use with various weather exposed, water utilizing devices, such as lawn sprinklers (Col. 1, lines 62-68 of '845). Furthermore, Hoggard teaches a thermostat unit that keeps a water freeze prevention device in a dormant state until one of the two pre-selected threshold temperatures is reached, and further, the ability to vary this range (Col. 6, lines 1-14 of '845).

11. Claims 9 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,479,339 to Miller (See IDS filed 2/23/04) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,191 to Bassett ***or*** U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0126295 to Doherty (See IDS filed 2/23/04) as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,870,302 to Oliver (See IDS filed 2/23/04), and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,763,845 to Hoggard.

Miller teaches all the limitations disclosed above, however, Miller fails to teach the system above, wherein, referring to claims 9 and 27, controlling of moisture flow includes the draining of all moisture delivery systems and ceasing of moisture delivery when said weather data indicates a forecast temperature for the landscaping area of a predetermined threshold temperature.

However, Oliver teaches analogous art, wherein referring to claims 9 and 27, Oliver teaches controlling of moisture flow includes the draining of all moisture delivery systems and ceasing of moisture delivery when weather data indicates a forecast temperature for the landscaping area (Col. 6, lines 45-58 of '302).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to further modify the teachings of Miller with the teachings of Oliver.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Oliver with the teachings of Miller, because Oliver teaches an automated irrigation control system that can predict weather conditions and computer watering factors therefrom (Col. 3, line 10 – Col. 4, line 32 of '302).

Referring to claims 9 and 27, Oliver fails to teach controlling of moisture flow as a function of a predetermined threshold temperature.

However, Hoggard teaches analogous art, wherein referring to claims 8 and 26, Hoggard teaches controlling of moisture flow includes the draining of all moisture delivery systems and ceasing of moisture delivery when said weather data indicates a temperature at the landscaping area has reached a predetermined threshold temperature (Col. 5, line 53 – Col. 6, line 14; Abstract; Col. 1, lines 5-19 of '845).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to further modify the teachings of Miller with the teachings of Hoggard.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Hoggard with the teachings of Miller, because Hoggard teaches and automatic water drainage/refill system for use with various weather exposed, water utilizing devices, such as lawn sprinklers (Col. 1, lines 62-68 of '845). Furthermore, Hoggard teaches a thermostat unit that keeps a water freeze prevention device in a dormant state until one of the two pre-selected threshold temperatures is reached, and further, the ability to vary this range (Col. 6, lines 1-14 of '845).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 2nd 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., simple and easily usable home-based irrigation management and control system) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations

from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

13. Applicant argues that Miller fails to teach a PC-based irrigation management and control system. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Miller teaches FIG. 3 is a block diagram of the control unit 14 and attached devices for irrigation, wherein Fig. 3 clearly shows that the control unit comprises a central processing unit (CPU) 25, memory means 27, including random access and read only memory, and control logic 24 stored in the memory means. Miller further teaches that the CPU may be a conventional microprocessor, such as an Intel 80-386, and further, the control unit comprises Input/Output (I/O) interface 29 for communicating with outside devices through a conventional address and data bus, such as bus 34a and bus 34b. Further still, Miller teaches the control unit is attached to operator communication means comprising a display 33 and keypad 35 to allow an operator to receive and send information, respectively, wherein although a keypad is shown as the preferred embodiment for sending information, the inventor recognizes that other means, such as a radio or interface to a known laptop computer (e.g., an RS-232 interface), could be used for the operator to communicate with the control unit (Col. 5, lines 41-63). The examiner notes the definition of a personal computer from The American Heritage College Dictionary 2002, 4th edition, Houghton Muifflin Company, as "a computer built around a microprocessor for use by an individual". Thus, the examiner respectfully submits that the control unit of Miller, built around a mircoprocessor, for use by an operator, is a personal computer.

Furthermore, while the examiner does not concede that the control unit of Miller is not a personal computer, the examiner respectfully notes that a recitation of the intended use of the

claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

14. Applicant argues that Bassett fails to teach a residence-based irrigation management and control system. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Bassett clearly teaches "bringing an appliance and/or an electrical or mechanical system of a residence into communication with another, or with a control device within the residence, or with an other communication source outside the residence, so as to establish a home automation system" (See Abstract), wherein it is clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that "an appliance and/or an electrical or mechanical system of a residence" (See Abstract) is "a lawn sprinkler system" (See Col. 1, lines 33-41).

15. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the automated residence management system of Bassett with the irrigation control and management system of Miller, because Bassett teaches home automation systems that control and manage a

systems, such as a lawn sprinkler system, are commonly known in the art, whereby interconnecting various systems, such as a lawn sprinkler system, "maintenance and operation of the residence can be handled in a more convenient and efficient manner" (Col. 1, lines 26-42). Furthermore, Bassett teaches an automation system that can connect a microprocessor control device to various appliances, including a lawn sprinkler system (Col. 1, line 38; Col. 2, lines 9-13 '191), wherein the invention of Bassett allows for performing diagnostic and analysis functions of said sprinkler system (Col. 2, line 13-20 of '191). The examiner respectfully asserts that the shifting of location of parts is well within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 1023, 86 USPQ 70, 73, (CCPA 1950).

16. Applicant argues that Doherty fails to teach a residence-based irrigation management and control system. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Doherty clearly teaches a system "for automated control of residential devices" (title) specifically geared toward residential devices such as a "home irrigation system" (Abstract).

17. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the residential gateway system for automated control of residential devices of Doherty with the irrigation control and management system of Miller, because Doherty teaches a system for

effective implementation of a residential gateway system for automated control of residential devices, such as a sprinkler (Page 3, paragraph 0026; Page 3, claim 2 of '295). The examiner respectfully asserts that the shifting of location of parts is well within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art In re Japikse, 181 F.2d 1019, 1023, 86 USPQ 70, 73, (CCPA 1950).

Conclusion

18. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

19. The prior art or art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents or publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to the term "personal computer".

The American Heritage College Dictionary 2002, 4th edition, Houghton Muifflin Company, page 1039.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean P. Shechtman whose telephone number is (571) 272-3754. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo P. Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SPS

Sean P. Shechtman

April 19, 2005

LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100